arXiv:1404.6677v2 [math.PR] 9 May 2014

STABILITY OF THE STOCHASTIC MATCHING MODEL

JEAN MAIRESSE AND PASCAL MOYAL

Abstract. We introduce and study a new model that we call the *matching model*. Items arrive one by one in a buffer and depart from it as soon as possible but by pairs. The items of a departing pair are said to be *matched*. There is a finite set of classes $\mathcal{V}$ for the items, and the allowed matchings depend on the classes, according to a *matching graph* on $\mathcal{V}$. Upon arrival, an item may find several possible matches in the buffer. This indeterminacy is resolved by a *matching policy*. When the sequence of classes of the arriving items is i.i.d., the sequence of buffer-contents is a Markov chain, whose stability is investigated. In particular, we prove that the model may be stable if and only if the matching graph is non-bipartite.

Keywords: Markovian queueing theory, stability, matching.
Mathematics Subject Classification (MSC2010): 60J10, 60K25, 68M20.

1. Introduction

A *matching model*, as described in the abstract, is formally specified by a triple (G, Φ, μ) formed by:

- a *matching graph* $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, that is, an undirected graph whose vertices $\mathcal{V}$ are the classes of items and whose edges $\mathcal{E}$ are the allowed matchings between classes;
- a *matching policy* Φ which defines the new buffer-content given the pair formed by the old buffer-content and the arriving item;
- a probability μ on $\mathcal{V}$, the common law of the i.i.d. classes of the arriving items.

The sequence of buffer-contents forms a Markov chain. The stability problem consists in determining the conditions on (G, Φ, μ) for the Markov chain to be positive recurrent.

Despite being simple and natural, the matching model seems to be original. The matching model has a queueing model flavor with the crucial specificity that items play the roles of both customers and servers. Specifically, the matching model is vaguely related to the models of "constrained queueing networks" [9], "input-queued cross-bar switches" [8], or "call centers with skills-based routing" [7, Section 5]. But the closest connection is with the "bipartite matching model" [2, 4, 5] and this link has to be carefully explicited.

The *bipartite matching (BM) model* has been introduced by Caldentey, Kaplan, and Weiss [5], see also [2, 1]. Here, items arrive by pairs in a buffer and depart from it, as soon as possible, and by pairs. There is a finite number of classes partitioned into "customer" classes and "server" classes. Each pair, arriving or departing, is formed by exactly one customer and one server. For departing pairs, an additional requirement is that the customer and the server should be matched, with the allowed

matchings depending on the classes only. The sequence of classes of arriving items is i.i.d. and, in each arriving pair, the customer is independent of the server. In [4], the same model is studied without the restriction that the arriving customer and server should be independent. For convenience, let us denote this last model by EBM (extended BM).

Clearly, the (E)BM model and the matching model are close. In fact, the matching model may be viewed as a particular case of the EBM model. Indeed, consider a matching model with graph $(\mathcal{V},\mathcal{E})$ and sequence of arriving items $(v_n)_n$. Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}$ be a disjoint copy of $\mathcal{V}$. Define a bipartite matching model with customer classes $\mathcal{V}$, server classes $\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}$, possible matches $\{(u,\tilde{v}) \mid (u,v)\in\mathcal{E}\}$, and arriving sequence $(v_n,\widetilde{v}_n)_n$. If the matching policies are the same, then, at any time, the buffer-content of the bipartite matching model is $(U,\widetilde{U})$ if the buffer-content of the original matching model is U. In this bipartite matching model, there is a perfect correlation between the arriving customer and server, so this is indeed an EBM model and not a BM model.

Due to the above connection, we can transfer the results proved for the EBM in [4] to the matching model. But, on the other hand, we are able to get more precise results for the matching model.

Content. Isolating the matching model as an interesting object of study is the first contribution of the present paper.

The second contribution is to show that the matching model may be stable iff the matching graph is non-bipartite (Theorem 2-(15)).

In a nutshell, the situation is as follows. A connected graph G is either bipartite or not. In the first case, we may construct a stable *bipartite* matching model on G (see [4]) but not a stable matching model. In the second case, we may construct a stable matching model on G (and the bipartite matching model is not even defined). Additional results are provided for matching models on a non-bipartite matching graph: (i) the model is always stable under the natural conditions for the "match the longest" policy (Theorem 2-(16)); (ii) this is not true for all matching policies (Proposition 3).

Notations. Consider a finite simple undirected graph $(\mathcal{V},\mathcal{E})$, $\mathcal{E}\subset(\mathcal{V}\times\mathcal{V})\setminus\{(v,v),v\in\mathcal{V}\}$, and $(u,v)\in\mathcal{E}\implies(v,u)\in\mathcal{E}$. We use the notation $u{-}v$ for $(u,v)\in\mathcal{E}$ and $u{\not-}v$ for $(u,v)\notin\mathcal{E}$. For $U\subset\mathcal{V}$, define $U^c=\mathcal{V}\setminus U$ and

$$\mathcal{E}(U)=\{v\in\mathcal{V}\mid\exists u\in U,\ u-v\}\,.$$

For $u\in V$, write $\mathcal{E}(u)=\mathcal{E}(\{u\})$. For $U\subset\mathcal{V}$, the *subgraph induced by* U is the graph $(U,\mathcal{E}\cap(U\times U))$. The notation $p:u\leftrightarrow v$ means that p is a path between u and v in the graph. The *length* of the path p, denoted $\ell(p)$, is the number of edges of p.

Given a finite set S, denote by $\mathcal{M}^+(S)$ the set of probability measures μ on S such that for all i in S, $\mu(i)>0$.

Denote by $\mathbb{N}$ the non-negative integers. Let A^* be the set of finite words over the alphabet A. For any word $w\in A^*$ and any letter $a\in A$, let $|w|_a$ be the number of occurrences of a in w. Let $|w|=\sum_{a\in A}|w|_a$ be the *length* of w. Let $[w]:=(|w|_a)_{a\in A}\in\mathbb{N}^A$ be the *commutative image* of w.

2. The matching model

A *matching graph* is a finite simple undirected graph $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ with $|\mathcal{V}| \geq 2$, $\mathcal{E} \subset (\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}) \setminus \{(v, v), v \in \mathcal{V}\}$ and $(u, v) \in \mathcal{E} \implies (v, u) \in \mathcal{E}$.

The *matching model* associated with the matching graph G is defined as follows. Start with an empty "buffer" and, for any n in $\mathbb{N}$, draw an element v_n of $\mathcal{V}$ and apply the following rule: (i) if there is no element j of $\mathcal{V}$ in the buffer such that $v_n - j$, then add v_n to the buffer; (ii) otherwise, do not add v_n and remove from the buffer an element j such that $v_n - j$ (we say that v_n and j are *matched* together). If several elements j of the buffer are such that $v_n - j$, the one to be removed depends on a *matching policy* to be specified.

The sequence $(v_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is assumed to be independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.). Throughout the paper, we denote by μ the common law over $\mathcal{V}$ of the elements v_n, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We always assume that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{V})$.

The stability problem of the matching model can be described in the following rough terms: what are the conditions on G, the matching policy, and the distribution μ such that the system is stable, in the sense that the buffer reaches an equilibrium behavior?

Example 1. Consider the matching graph $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ with $\mathcal{V} = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and $\mathcal{E} = \{1 - 2, 2 - 3, 2 - 4, 3 - 4\}$, see Figure 1.



FIGURE 1. The matching graph of Example 1.

Consider the sequence $(v_n)_n = 3, 1, 4, 2, 4, 4, 1, 2, 3, 2, 1, 4, \ldots$. Denote by U_n the ordered sequence of elements in the buffer after the arrivals of $v_0, \ldots, v_{n-1}$. We have

$$U_1 = (3),\ U_2 = (3, 1),\ U_3 = (1),\ U_4 = \emptyset,\ U_5 = (4\},\ U_6 = (4, 4),\ U_7 = (4, 4, 1),$$

and U_8 depends on the matching policy: indeed $v_7 = 2$ can be matched either with $v_4 = 4$, $v_5 = 4$, or with $v_6 = 1$. A convenient way of visualizing the dynamic is given in Figure 2 (assuming that v_7 is matched with v_6).



FIGURE 2. The matching model in action.

3. **Structural properties of the matching graph**

The conditions NCOND, defined below, will turn out to be necessary for the stability of the matching model (Proposition 2 hereafter). This justifies a thorough study of these conditions, which is the purpose of this section.

A *facet* of G is a non-empty subset $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{V}$ such that

$$\forall i \neq j \in \mathcal{F}, \qquad i \not\to j \, .$$

Let $\mathbb{F}$ be the set of facets of G.

Let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{V})$. Define the following conditions on the probability measure μ :

$$\text{NCOND:} \quad \forall \mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}, \qquad \mu(\mathcal{F}) \; < \; \mu\left(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})\right).$$

We first observe the following.

Lemma 1. *For any connected graph G,* NCOND *is equivalent to*

$$\forall U \subset \mathcal{V}, \; U \neq \emptyset, \; U \neq \mathcal{V}, \qquad \mu(U) \; < \; \mu\left(\mathcal{E}(U)\right). \tag{1}$$

Proof. It is clear that (1) entails NCOND, let us focus on the converse. Consider $U \subset \mathcal{V}, \; U \neq \emptyset, \; U \neq \mathcal{V}$, such that U is not a facet. Notice that this implies in particular that $|U| > 1$.

(i) Assume first that the subgraph induced by U is connected. Then, $\forall u \in U, \exists v \in U, \; u - v$. This implies that $U \subset \mathcal{E}(U)$. Also, since G is connected and $U \neq \mathcal{V}$, we have that $U \subsetneq \mathcal{E}(U)$. Therefore, $\mu(U) < \mu(\mathcal{E}(U))$.

(ii) Assume now that the subgraph induced by U has several connected components. Let $U = U_1 \cup U_2$, where U_1 is the union of the connected components of cardinality 1, and U_2 is the union of the other connected components. The set U_2 is non-empty, otherwise U would be a facet. Moreover, $\forall u \in U_2, \exists v \in U_2, \; u - v$, hence exactly as in case (i), we have that

$$U_2 \subsetneq \mathcal{E}\left(U_2\right). \tag{2}$$

Now, if U_1 is empty, we have $U_2 = U$ and (2) completes the proof. If not, U_1 is a facet and from NCOND,

$$\mu(U_1) < \mu\left(\mathcal{E}\left(U_1\right)\right).$$

Also, (2) entails that $\left(\mathcal{E}(U_1) \cup U_2\right) \subset \mathcal{E}(U)$, and since by definition, $\mathcal{E}(U_1) \cap U_2 = \emptyset$, we conclude that

$$\mu(U) = \mu(U_1) + \mu(U_2) < \mu(\mathcal{E}(U_1)) + \mu(U_2) = \mu(\mathcal{E}(U_1) \cup U_2) \leq \mu(\mathcal{E}(U)) \, ,$$

which concludes the proof.

□

With some abuse, let us denote by NCOND, the subset of probability measures μ such that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{V})$, and the conditions NCOND are satisfied.

Example 2. The set of facets is $\mathbb{F} = \big\{\{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}, \{4\}, \{1,3\}, \{1,4\}\big\}$ for the matching graph of Figure 1. Therefore,

$$\text{NCOND} = \begin{cases} \mu(1) < \mu(2) < 1/2 \\ \mu(1) + \mu(3) < 1/2 \\ \mu(1) + \mu(4) < 1/2 \end{cases} . \tag{3}$$

Making the simplifying assumption $\mu(3) = \mu(4)$, we get

$$\textsc{Ncond} \cap \{\mu(3) = \mu(4)\} = \{\mu(1) < \mu(2) < 1/2\},$$

see Figure 3.



FIGURE 3. In gray, the projection of the region $\textsc{Ncond} \cap \{\mu(3) = \mu(4)\}$.

Specific conditions for bipartite graphs. Assume that G is bipartite and let $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_1 \cup \mathcal{V}_2$ be a bi-partition of the vertices. The following conditions $\textsc{Ncond}_{1/2}$ on the probability measures $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{V})$, will be a useful tool in some of the proofs :

$$\textsc{Ncond}_{1/2}: \quad \mu(\mathcal{V}_1) = \mu(\mathcal{V}_2) = 1/2, \qquad \forall \mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}, \qquad \mu(\mathcal{F}) < \mu\left(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})\right).$$

The set of measures $\textsc{Ncond}_{1/2}$ is defined likewise $\textsc{Ncond}$.

The doubling graph. Given a graph $G = (\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{V})$, define its *doubling-graph* $2 \circ G = (2 \circ \mathcal{V}, 2 \circ \mathcal{E})$ by

$$2 \circ \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V} \ \cup \ \left\{\tilde{u} \mid u \in \mathcal{V}\right\}, \qquad 2 \circ \mathcal{E} = \left\{(u, \tilde{v}), (\tilde{v}, u) \mid (u, v) \in \mathcal{E}\right\}, \tag{4}$$

where the set $\tilde{\mathcal{V}} = \left\{\tilde{u} \mid u \in \mathcal{V}\right\}$ is a disjoint copy of $\mathcal{V}$. Also denote by $2 \circ \mathbb{F}$, the set of facets of $2 \circ G$, and for all $U \subset 2 \circ \mathcal{V}$, let $2 \circ \mathcal{E}(U)$ be the set of neighbors of U in $2 \circ G$. The doubling-graph of the graph of Example 1 is given in Figure 4.



FIGURE 4. The matching graph of Example 1, together with its doubling-graph.

Consider a probability μ on $\mathcal{V}$, and define the probability $2 \circ \mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(2 \circ \mathcal{V})$ by

$$\forall u \in \mathcal{V}, \qquad 2 \circ \mu(u) = 2 \circ \mu(\tilde{u}) = \mu(u)/2\,.$$

Observe the following connection between $\textsc{Ncond}$ and $\textsc{Ncond}_{1/2}$.

Lemma 2. *We have*

$$\left[\mu \in \textsc{Ncond}(G)\right] \iff \left[2 \circ \mu \in \textsc{Ncond}_{1/2}(2 \circ G)\right]. \tag{5}$$

Proof. ($\Longrightarrow$). Let $\mathcal{F} \in 2 \circ \mathbb{F}$. We can then write $\mathcal{F} = A \cup \tilde{B}$, $A \subset \mathcal{V}$, $\tilde{B} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{V}}$. Observe that the corresponding subset $A \cup B$ of $\mathcal{V}$ is not a facet of G in general, because neither A nor B are so. But thanks to Lemma 1, we may write that

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \circ \mu(\mathcal{F}) \quad &= \mu(A)/2 + \mu(B)/2 \quad < \mu\left(\mathcal{E}(A)\right)/2 + \mu\left(\mathcal{E}(B)\right)/2 \\ &= 2 \circ \mu\left(2 \circ \mathcal{E}(A)\right) + 2 \circ \mu\left(2 \circ \mathcal{E}(\tilde{B})\right) \\ &= 2 \circ \mu\left(2 \circ \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that $2 \circ \mathcal{E}(A)$ and $2 \circ \mathcal{E}(\tilde{B})$ form a partition of $2 \circ \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})$.
($\Longleftarrow$). Let $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}$ and let $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ be its copy in $\tilde{\mathcal{V}}$. Clearly, $\mathcal{F} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{F}} \in 2 \circ \mathbb{F}$, therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\mathcal{F}) \quad &= 2 \circ \mu\left(\mathcal{F} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{F}}\right) \quad < 2 \circ \mu\left(2 \circ \mathcal{E}\left(\mathcal{F} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{F}}\right)\right) \\ &= 2 \circ \mu\left(2 \circ \mathcal{E}\left(\mathcal{F}\right)\right) + 2 \circ \mu\left(2 \circ \mathcal{E}\left(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}\right)\right) \\ &= \mu\left(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})\right)/2 + \mu\left(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})\right)/2 = \mu\left(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})\right). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. □

Checking the conditions NCOND. Given G and μ, how to check efficiently whether the conditions NCOND hold?

The cardinality of $\mathcal{F}$ is exponential in $|\mathcal{V}|$, so checking directly all the inequalities yields an algorithm of exponential time-complexity. But it is possible to do better.

Proposition 1. *Given a graph $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ and a probability μ on $\mathcal{V}$, there exists an algorithm of time complexity $O(|\mathcal{V}|^3)$ to decide if* NCOND *is satisfied.*

Proof. In [4, Prop. 3.5], it is proved that for a bipartite graph, checking $\textsc{Ncond}_{1/2}$ can be done with an algorithm of time complexity $O(|\mathcal{V}|^3)$. The proof relies on a network flow argument. Using Lemma 2, we obtain the result for NCOND as a direct corollary. □

3.1. **Main result.** The main result to be proved is the following.

Theorem 1. *Let G be a connected graph. We have*

$$\left[G \text{ non-bipartite}\right] \iff \left[\textsc{Ncond} \neq \emptyset\right]. \tag{6}$$

Throughout this section, we let G be a connected graph, without further notice. Let us prove some preliminary results.

Lemma 3. *We have*

$$\left[G \text{ bipartite}\right] \implies \left[\textsc{Ncond} = \emptyset\right].$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_1 \cup \mathcal{V}_2$ be a bi-partition of the vertices of G. Since G is connected, we have $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{V}_1) = \mathcal{V}_2$ and $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{V}_2) = \mathcal{V}_1$. The corresponding conditions in NCOND are

$$\mu(\mathcal{V}_1) < \mu(\mathcal{V}_2); \qquad \mu(\mathcal{V}_2) < \mu(\mathcal{V}_1)\,, \tag{7}$$

hence the result. □

The following implication is proved in [4, Theorem 4.2]:

$$\big[G \text{ bipartite}\big] \implies \big[\textsc{Ncond}_{1/2} \neq \emptyset\big]\,. \tag{8}$$

Comparing Lemma 3 and (8), we see that (7) is the only contradiction preventing NCOND to hold whenever G is bipartite.

Define now the following two properties for the graph G,

$$[\textsc{o} \wedge \textsc{e}\,(G)]: \quad \forall u, v \in \mathcal{V},\ \exists p : u \leftrightarrow v, \exists q : u \leftrightarrow v,\ \ell(p) \text{ is odd},\ \ell(q) \text{ is even}\,;$$
$$[\textsc{o} \vee \textsc{e}\,(G)]: \quad \forall u, v \in \mathcal{V}, \forall p : u \leftrightarrow v,\ \ell(p) \text{ has the same parity}\,.$$

Lemma 4. *We have* $[\textsc{o} \wedge \textsc{e}\,(G)] \Longleftrightarrow \neg[\textsc{o} \vee \textsc{e}\,(G)]$.

Proof. Clearly, $[\textsc{o} \wedge \textsc{e}\,(G)]$ entails $\neg[\textsc{o} \vee \textsc{e}\,(G)]$. For the converse, assume that there exists $u, v \in \mathcal{V}$ and $p, q : u \leftrightarrow v$ such that $\ell(p)$ is odd and $\ell(q)$ is even. Consider any pair of vertices $x, y \in \mathcal{V}$. By connectedness, there exists $r : x \leftrightarrow u$ and $s : v \leftrightarrow y$. By construction, we have: $rps : x \leftrightarrow y$ and $rqs : x \leftrightarrow y$, and $\ell(rps)$ and $\ell(rqs)$ have different parities. So $[\textsc{o} \wedge \textsc{e}\,(G)]$ holds. □

Lemma 5. *We have* $\big[G \text{ non-bipartite}\big] \iff \big[2 \circ G \text{ connected}\big]$.

Proof. Assume that G is bipartite. Let $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_1 \cup \mathcal{V}_2$ be a bi-partition of the vertices of G. Denote the vertices of the doubling-graph $2 \circ G = (2 \circ \mathcal{V}, 2 \circ \mathcal{E})$ by $2 \circ \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_1 \cup \mathcal{V}_2 \cup \widetilde{\mathcal{V}}_1 \cup \widetilde{\mathcal{V}}_2$. By definition, in $2 \circ G$, we have that $2 \circ \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{V}_1) = \widetilde{\mathcal{V}}_2$ and $2 \circ \mathcal{E}(\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}_2) = \mathcal{V}_1$. Therefore, $2 \circ G$ has two connected components, one with vertices $\mathcal{V}_1 \cup \widetilde{\mathcal{V}}_2$ and the other one with vertices $\mathcal{V}_2 \cup \widetilde{\mathcal{V}}_1$.

For the converse, first notice that G bipartite clearly implies $[\textsc{o} \vee \textsc{e}\,(G)]$. Now assume that the property $[\textsc{o} \vee \textsc{e}\,(G)]$ holds. Let u be a fixed vertex. Let $\mathcal{V}_o$ be the set of vertices at odd distance from u, and let $\mathcal{V}_e$ be the set of vertices at even distance from u. The sets $\mathcal{V}_o$ and $\mathcal{V}_e$ form a bipartition of $\mathcal{V}$ and the graph G is bipartite. To summarize, we have proved that $[G \text{ bipartite}] \iff [\textsc{o} \vee \textsc{e}\,(G)]$, which together with Lemma 4, amounts to

$$[G \text{ non-bipartite}] \iff [\textsc{o} \wedge \textsc{e}\,(G)]\,. \tag{9}$$

Let us come back to the proof of the statement: $[2 \circ G \text{ non-connected}] \implies [G \text{ bipartite}]$. Assume that G is non-bipartite. By (9), we have $[\textsc{o} \wedge \textsc{e}\,(G)]$. Denote the vertices of $2 \circ G$ by $\mathcal{V} = \{u, v, \dots\}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{V}} = \{\tilde{u}, \tilde{v}, \dots\}$. Clearly, u is linked to $\tilde{v}$ in $2 \circ G$ iff u is linked to v by a path of odd length in G. Similarly, u is linked to v in $2 \circ G$ iff u is linked to v by a path of even length in G. Since the property $[\textsc{o} \wedge \textsc{e}\,(G)]$ holds, we conclude that $2 \circ G$ is connected. This completes the proof. □

3.2. **Proof of Theorem 1.** Let us consider the equivalence (6). Lemma 3 establishes one direction, and it remains to prove that $\big[\textsc{Ncond} = \emptyset\big] \implies \big[G \text{ bipartite}\big]$.

We need to recall an auxiliary result. Consider a *directed* bipartite graph $D = (\mathcal{V}_1 \cup \mathcal{V}_2, \mathcal{E}_1 \cup \mathcal{E}_2)$, $\mathcal{E}_1 \subset \mathcal{V}_1 \times \mathcal{V}_2$, $\mathcal{E}_2 \subset \mathcal{V}_2 \times \mathcal{V}_1$. Given $\nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{E}_2)$, define $\bar\nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{V}_1 \cup \mathcal{V}_2)$ by

$$\forall u \in \mathcal{V}_1,\ \bar\nu(u) = \nu(\mathcal{V}_2 \times \{u\})/2, \quad \forall u \in \mathcal{V}_2,\ \bar\nu(u) = \nu(\{u\} \times \mathcal{V}_1)/2\,.$$

The next statement is a direct consequence of [4, Theorem 4.2]. Assume that D is strongly connected, then

$$\exists\, \nu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{E}_2), \qquad \bar\nu \in \textsc{Ncond}_{1/2}(UD)\,, \tag{10}$$

where $UD = (\mathcal{V}_1 \cup \mathcal{V}_2, \mathcal{E}_1 \cup \{(v,u) \mid (u,v) \in \mathcal{E}_1\})$.

Let us get back to the proof. Assume that G is connected and non-bipartite. According to Lemma 5, the graph $2 \circ G$ is connected. Consider the *directed* graph D defined by

$$\text{nodes: } 2 \circ \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V} \cup \tilde{\mathcal{V}}, \qquad \text{arcs: } \{u \to \tilde v \mid (u,v) \in \mathcal{E}\} \cup \{\tilde u \to u \mid u \in \mathcal{V}\}\,.$$

It is easy to prove that D is strongly connected. Let us apply (10) to D with $\mathcal{E}_2 = \{\tilde u \to u \mid u \in \mathcal{V}\}$. We obtain the existence of $\bar\nu \in \textsc{Ncond}_{1/2}(2 \circ G)$ and, by construction, $\bar\nu(u) = \bar\nu(\tilde u)$ for all $u \in \mathcal{V}$. Therefore, according to (5), the probability measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{V})$ defined by

$$\mu(u) = \bar\nu(u) + \bar\nu(\tilde u),\ u \in \mathcal{V},$$

belongs to $\textsc{Ncond}(G)$. This completes the proof.

4. **Stability of the matching model**

Let us precise the definition of the matching model given in §2. A *matching model* is specified by a triple (G, Φ, μ), that we now detail.

First, $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ is the matching graph defined as in §2, and assumed to be connected.

Second, Φ is the matching policy defined as follows. We view the state of the buffer as a word over the alphabet $\mathcal{V}$. More precisely, the state space is

$$\mathcal{U} = \Big\{u \in \mathcal{V}^* \mid \forall (i,j) \in \mathcal{E},\ |u|_i \times |u|_j = 0\Big\}$$

and we denote by $U_n \in \mathcal{U}$, the state of the system just before the arrival of item v_n, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The *matching policy* is a mapping $\Phi : \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{U}$. In words, $\Phi(U, v)$ is the new buffer-content after the arrival of an element v in a buffer of content U. Observe that only the current state of the buffer is taken into account, which is a restriction, but a reasonable one.

Third, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{V})$ is the probability distribution of the arrivals. Precisely, the sequence of arriving items $(v_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is i.i.d. of common law μ.

Let $\mathbf{0}$ be the empty word of $\mathcal{V}^*$. Given a matching model (G, Φ, μ) and a sequence of arrivals $(v_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, the sequence of buffer-contents $(U_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a Markov chain over the state space $\mathcal{U}$ satisfying

$$U_0 = \mathbf{0}, \qquad U_{n+1} = \Phi(U_n, v_n);\ n \in \mathbb{N}\,.$$

This Markov chain is clearly irreducible and periodic of period 2. We say that the matching model is *stable* if $(U_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is positive recurrent.

Consider the pair (G, Φ) formed by the matching graph and the matching policy. The *stability region* of (G, Φ) is the subset of $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{V})$ formed by the probability measures μ such that (G, Φ, μ) is stable.

4.1. **More on matching policies.** The matching policy may depend on the order of the items (i.e. on their arrival dates). An example is FCFS ("First Come, First Served"), where an arriving item of class j is matched with the oldest (if any) item of class i in the buffer such that $j-i$.

Other matching policies are independent of the arrival dates. In such cases, the matching decision at time n depends only on the commutative image $[U]$ of the state $U \in \mathcal{U}$. In other words, the sequence $([U_n])_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a Markov chain on the state space

$$[\mathcal{U}] = \left\{ u \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{V}} \mid \forall (i,j) \in \mathcal{E},\ u_i \times u_j = 0 \right\}.$$

Below, we consider two such policies: "Match the longest" and "Priority". For $i \in \mathcal{V}$, let $e_i \in \mathbb{N}^{\mathcal{V}}$ be defined by $(e_i)_i = 1$ and $(e_i)_j = 0, j \neq i$.

Match the Longest is the matching policy $\mathrm{ML} : [\mathcal{U}] \times \mathcal{V} \longrightarrow [\mathcal{U}]$ defined by

$$(U,i) \longmapsto \begin{cases} U + e_i & \text{if } \big[j \in \mathcal{E}(i) \implies U_j = 0 \big]; \\ U - e_j,\ j = \max\{ \textsc{argmax}\ U_{|\mathcal{E}(i)} \} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

where $\textsc{argmax}\ U_{|\mathcal{E}(i)}$ is the set of indices k of $\mathcal{E}(i)$ for which U_k is positive and maximal. This set is non-empty and j is the maximum with respect to some given total order on $\mathcal{V}$. In words, ML consists in giving priority to the more represented compatible class in the buffer.

Let us now define the priority policies. For each $i \in \mathcal{V}$, define the *preferences* of i as a total order on the set $\mathcal{E}(i)$. *Priority* is the matching policy $\Phi : [\mathcal{U}] \times \mathcal{V} \longrightarrow [\mathcal{U}]$ defined by

$$(U,i) \longmapsto \begin{cases} U + e_i & \text{if } \big[j \in \mathcal{E}(i) \implies U_j = 0 \big]; \\ U - e_j,\ j = \max\{ \mathcal{E}(i) \cap \operatorname{supp} U \} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

where $\operatorname{supp} U = \{ j \in \mathcal{V} \mid U_j > 0 \}$. In the above second case, the set $\mathcal{E}(i) \cap \operatorname{supp} U$ is non-empty and j is the maximum with respect to the preferences of i on $\mathcal{E}(i)$.

4.2. **The results.** Our first result states that NCOND are necessary stability conditions. An analog result holds for the bipartite matching model (Lemma 3.2 of [4]).

Proposition 2. *Consider a connected matching graph G and a matching policy Φ. We have for all $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathcal{V})$,*

$$(G, \Phi, \mu)\ \textit{stable} \implies \mu \in \textsc{Ncond}.$$

Proof. First assume that we have $\mu(\mathcal{F}) > \mu\left(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})\right)$ for some facet $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathbb{F}$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{F}_n$ be the number of elements of $\mathcal{F}$ in the system at time n, F_n be the number of arrivals of type $\mathcal{F}$ up to time n, and E_n, the number of arrivals of type $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})$ up to time n. Denote finally $H_n = F_n - E_n$. Observe that

$$|U_n| \geq \mathcal{F}_n \geq H_n\,. \tag{13}$$

By the strong law of large numbers, we get

$$\frac{|U_n|}{n} \geq \frac{H_n}{n} \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \mu(\mathcal{F}) - \mu(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})) > 0 \qquad \text{a.s..} \tag{14}$$

This implies that $(U_n)_n$ is transient.

Suppose now that for some $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}$, $\mu(\mathcal{F}) = \mu(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F}))$. In that case, the Markov chain $(H_n)_n$ is null recurrent. Again, in view of (13), the Markov chain $(U_n)_n$ cannot be positive recurrent. □

The graph G is said *separable of order* p, $p \geq 2$, if there exists a partition of $\mathcal{V}$ into facets $\mathcal{F}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{F}_p$, such that

$$\forall i \neq j,\ \forall u \in \mathcal{F}_i,\ \forall v \in \mathcal{F}_j,\ u - v\,.$$

In other words, G is separable of order p if its complementary graph can be partitioned into p cliques. Notice that a separable graph of order 2 is bipartite, and a separable graph or order 3 or more is non-bipartite. In Figure 5, we provide an example of bipartite separable graph.



FIGURE 5. Separable graph of order 2 (left) and the complementary graph (right).

Theorem 2. *Consider a connected matching graph G. Let* POL *be the set of matching policies. Let* ML *be the "Match the Longest" policy, see (11). We have*

$$G \text{ non-bipartite} \iff \exists \Phi \in \textsc{Pol}, \exists \mu \in \textsc{Ncond},\ [(G, \Phi, \mu) \text{ stable }] \tag{15}$$

$$G \text{ non-bipartite} \implies \forall \mu \in \textsc{Ncond},\ [(G, \mathrm{ML}, \mu) \text{ stable }] \tag{16}$$

$$G \text{ separable, } p \geq 3 \implies \forall \Phi \in \textsc{Pol}, \forall \mu \in \textsc{Ncond},\ [(G, \Phi, \mu) \text{ stable }]\,. \tag{17}$$

By merging Theorem 2 with the results from [4], we get the following. A connected matching graph G is either bipartite or not. In the first case, we may construct a stable *bipartite* matching model on G (as in [4]) but not a stable matching model. In the second case, we may construct a stable matching model on G (and the bipartite matching model is not even defined).

Proof of Theorem 2. According to (6) in Theorem 1, the set NCOND is non-empty iff G is non-bipartite. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \exists \Phi \in \textsc{Pol}, \exists \mu \in \textsc{Ncond},\ [(G, \Phi, \mu) \text{ stable }] &\implies \textsc{Ncond} \neq \emptyset \\ &\implies G \text{ non-bipartite}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Let us now prove that (16) holds. Together with (18), it will also prove (15). Let $\mu \in \textsc{Ncond}$. Consider the doubling-graph $2 \circ G = (2 \circ \mathcal{V}, 2 \circ \mathcal{E})$ defined in (4). According to Lemma 5, we have $2 \circ \mu \in \textsc{Ncond}_{1/2}(2 \circ G)$.

Consider the bipartite matching model on the graph $2 \circ G$ with matching policy ML and i.i.d. arriving sequence $(v_n, \widetilde{v}_n)_n$ of common law $2 \circ \mu$. By induction, one proves that the state of the system is exactly $([U_n], [\widetilde{U}_n])_n$. Since $2 \circ \mu \in \textsc{Ncond}_{1/2}(2 \circ G)$, according to Theorem 7.1 in [4], the Markov chain $([U_n], [\widetilde{U}_n])_n$ is positive recurrent. We deduce that $([U_n])_n$ is positive recurrent as well. This completes the proof of (16).

The only point that remains to be proved is (17). Assume that G is separable of order $p \geq 3$. Let $\mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_p$ be the facets partitioning $\mathcal{V}$. For any $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}$, there exists i such that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{F}_i$, and $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})^c = \mathcal{F}_i$. Therefore,

$$\forall \mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F},\ \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})^c \in \mathbb{F}\,. \tag{19}$$

For $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}$, define $\mathcal{F}' = \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})^c$. Observe that $\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F}')$. In particular, we have

$$\left[\mu(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F})^c) < \mu(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F}))\right] \iff \left[\mu(\mathcal{F}') < \mu(\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{F}'))\right]. \tag{20}$$

Since G is non-bipartite, $\textsc{Ncond}$ is non-empty. Assume that $\mu \in \textsc{Ncond}$ so that the right-hand side of (20) holds. Therefore, the left-hand side of (20) holds as well for all $\mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{F}$.

Consider the Lyapunov function L, defined for all $u \in \mathcal{U}$ by

$$L(u) = |u|\ .$$

Fix $U_n = u \in \mathcal{U} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, and consider the facet $\mathcal{F}^u = \left\{i \in \mathcal{V}\ ;\ |u|_i > 0\right\}$. For any matching policy, the size of the buffer decreases (respectively, increases) at time $n+1$ if and only if $v_{n+1} \in \mathcal{E}\left(\mathcal{F}^u\right)$ (resp., $v_{n+1} \notin \mathcal{E}\left(\mathcal{F}^u\right)$). Hence

$$\mathbf{E}\left[L\left(U_{n+1}\right) - L(u) \mid U_n = u\right] = \mu\left(\mathcal{E}\left(\mathcal{F}^u\right)^c\right) - \mu\left(\mathcal{E}\left(\mathcal{F}^u\right)\right) < 0.$$

We conclude that the model is stable by applying the Lyapunov-Foster Theorem (see for instance [3, §5.1]). □

Summarizing Theorem 2, for a bipartite graph, the matching model is always unstable, and for a separable graph, it is stable under the natural conditions $\textsc{Ncond}$.

To complete the picture, we consider the simplest graph which is neither bipartite nor separable, that is, the graph of Example 1. We will see in the next section that there exists a matching policy for which the stability region is non-empty and strictly included in $\textsc{Ncond}$.

5. **Detailed study of the model of Example 1**

Consider again the matching graph of Figure 1. For simplicity, we assume that $\mu(3) = \mu(4)$.

Let us fix a matching policy and denote by $\textsc{Stab}$ the stability region of the model. According to (3), we have $\textsc{Ncond} = \{\mu(1) < \mu(2) < 1/2\}$. By Proposition 2, we have $\textsc{Stab} \subset \{\mu(1) < \mu(2) < 1/2\}$. Let us refine these statements with a non-trivial sufficient stability condition.

Lemma 6. *The stability region satisfies*

$$\left\{\mu(1) < \mu(2) < 1/2\right\} \cap \left\{\mu(1)(1-\mu(1)) < \mu(2)^2\right\} \subset \textsc{Stab} \subset \left\{\mu(1) < \mu(2) < 1/2\right\}.$$

Proof. We only have to prove the left inclusion. Assume NCOND is satisfied. For u in the state space $\mathcal{U}$, set $|u|_{34} = |u|_3 + |u|_4$, the number of items of type "3 or 4". Fix η such that

$$\mu(1)\mu(2)^{-1} < 1 - \eta < 1 \tag{21}$$

and consider the Lyapunov function

$$L_\eta : \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \mathcal{U} & \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \\ u & \longmapsto (1-\eta)|u|_1 + |u|_2 + \mu(1)\mu(2)^{-1}\ |u|_{34}. \end{array} \right.$$

Let us compute, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\Delta_\eta = \mathbf{E}\left[L_\eta\left(U_{n+1}\right) - L_\eta\left(U_n\right) \mid U_n = u\right]$$

in the different regions of the state space. If $|u|_2 > 0$, we have

$$\Delta_\eta = \mu(2) - (1 - \mu(2)) = 2\mu(2) - 1,$$

so $\Delta_\eta < 0$ according to NCOND. If $|u|_{34} > 0$, we have

$$\Delta_\eta = (1-\eta)\mu(1) + \mu(3)\mu(1)\mu(2)^{-1} - \mu(3)\mu(1)\mu(2)^{-1} - \mu(2)\alpha = (1-\eta)\mu(1) - \mu(2)\alpha,$$

where $\alpha = 1 - \eta$ if the arriving item of type 2 is matched with a buffered item of type 1, and $\alpha = \mu(1)\mu(2)^{-1}$ otherwise. From (21), we get

$$\Delta_\eta \leq (1-\eta)\mu(1) - \mu(2)\mu(1)\mu(2)^{-1} = -\eta\mu(1) < 0\,.$$

If $|u|_1 > 0$ and $|u|_{34} = 0$, we have

$$\Delta_\eta = (1-\eta)\mu(1) + 2\mu(3)\mu(1)\mu(2)^{-1} - (1-\eta)\mu(2)\,.$$

Replacing $2\mu(3)$ by $[1 - \mu(1) - \mu(2)]$ and symplifying, we get

$$\left[\Delta_\eta < 0\right] \iff \left[\eta\mu(2)(\mu(2) - \mu(1)) + \mu(1)(1 - \mu(1)) < \mu(2)^2\right].$$

Applying again the Lyapunov-Foster Theorem to the subset $A = \{\mathbf{0}\}$, the model is stable on any region NCOND $\cap \{\eta\mu(2)(\mu(2) - \mu(1)) + \mu(1)(1 - \mu(1)) < \mu(2)^2\}$, for η satisfying (21). By letting η go to 0, we obtain the left inclusion of Lemma 6. □

According to Theorem 2, the ML policy has a maximal stability region and reaches the right bound in Lemma 6. It is then natural to wonder, whether there exists a matching policy with the smallest possible stability region, that is, reaching the left bound in Lemma 6.

To investigate this question, let us introduce two matching policies of the *priority* type, see (12):

- Policy A: 2 gives priority to "3 or 4" over 1;
- Policy B: 2 gives priority to 1 over "3 or 4".

Denote by STAB(A) and STAB(B), the stability regions of policy A and B, respectively.

We use a simplified state space description $\breve{\mathcal{U}}$, by considering the commutative image of the states and by merging items 3 and 4 :

$$\breve{\mathcal{U}} = \left\{(0, \ell, 0), \ell \in \mathbb{N}\right\} \cup \left\{(k, 0, m),\ k, m \in \mathbb{N}\right\} = \breve{\mathcal{U}}_2 \cup \breve{\mathcal{U}}_{134}.$$

The buffer-content is described by the $\breve{\mathcal{U}}$- valued Markov chain $(\breve{U}_n)_n$, where for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\breve{U}_n(1) = |U_n|_1,\ \breve{U}_n(2) = |U_n|_2,\ \breve{U}_n(3) = |U_n|_{34}.$$

Observe that $(\breve{U}_n)_n$ has to go through state $(0,0,0)$ to go from $\breve{\mathcal{U}}_2$ to $\breve{\mathcal{U}}_{134}$ (or the other way around). Due to this property, $(\breve{U}_n)_n$ is positive recurrent iff the induced Markov chains on $\breve{\mathcal{U}}_2$ and $\breve{\mathcal{U}}_{134}$ are both positive recurrent.

Let us consider first the induced Markov chain on $\breve{\mathcal{U}}_2$. It is the same for the two priority policies and its transition matrix P satisfies

$$\forall i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}, \qquad P_{i,i-1} = 1 - \mu(2), \quad P_{i,i+1} = \mu(2)\,.$$

So the stability condition of the induced chain is $\mu(2) < 1 - \mu(2)$, that is

$$\mu(2) < 1/2.$$

Now consider the induced Markov chains on $\breve{\mathcal{U}}_{134}$, which depend on the priority policy. The two induced chains are random walks on $\mathbb{Z}_+^2$, meaning that the transition probabilities are homogeneous in the interior of the state space, and along each of the axis.

Denote by Q_A and Q_B the transition matrices of the induced chains under the policies A and B respectively. The graphs of Q_A and Q_B are represented in Figure 6, where (i,j) corresponds to the state $(i,0,j)$.



FIGURE 6. The graph of Q_A (left), and that of Q_B (right).

Let us justify, for instance, the coefficients

$$(Q_A)_{ij,i(j-1)} = \mu(2) + \mu(3),\ i \geq 0,\ j > 0.$$

In state (i,j), there are either j items of type 3 or j items of type 4. In the first case (resp. second case), one of the j items is removed if an item of type 4 (resp., of type 3) arrives. In both cases, such an event occurs with the same probability $\mu(3) = \mu(4)$. Further, due to the priority policy, one of the j items is also removed whenever an item of type 2 arrives (probability $\mu(2)$).

The detailed study of random walks in $\mathbb{Z}_+^2$ is carried out in the monograph [6]. The salient result [6, Theorem 3.3.1], is the necessary and sufficient condition for positive recurrence in terms of the one-step drifts of the random walk on the interior of the quadrant, and on each of the axes. It applies directly to our context.

Let us first consider policy A. The drifts of the Markov chain are

$$\begin{array}{rll} \text{Interior}: & D_x = \mu(1), & D_y = -\mu(2) \\ \text{First axis}: & D'_x = \mu(1) - \mu(2), & D'_y = 2\mu(3) \\ \text{Second axis}: & D''_x = \mu(1), & D''_y = -\mu(2)\,. \end{array}$$

Since $D_x > 0$ and $D_y < 0$, the Markov chain is stable iff $[D_x D'_y - D_y D'_x < 0]$, see [6, Theorem 3.3.1]. We have

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \big[D_x D'_y - D_y D'_x < 0\big] & \iff & \big[2\mu(1)\mu(3) + \mu(2)(\mu(1) - \mu(2)) < 0\big] \\ & \iff & \big[\mu(1)(1 - \mu(1)) < \mu(2)^2\big]\,. \end{array}$$

We now turn to the priority policy B. The drifts of the Markov chain read

$$\begin{array}{rll} \text{Interior}: & D_x = \mu(1) - \mu(2), & D_y = 0 \\ \text{First axis}: & D'_x = \mu(1) - \mu(2), & D'_y = 2\mu(3) \\ \text{Second axis}: & D''_x = \mu(1), & D''_y = -\mu(2)\,. \end{array}$$

Since $D_x < 0$ and $D_y = 0$, the Markov chain is stable iff $[D_y D''_x - D_x D''_y < 0]$, see [6, Theorem 3.3.1]. We have

$$\big[D_y D''_x - D_x D''_y < 0\big] \iff \big[\mu(2)(\mu(1) - \mu(2)) < 0\big] \iff \big[\mu(1) < \mu(2)\big]\,.$$

Summarizing all of the above, we get the next proposition.

Proposition 3. *The stability regions under policies A and B are respectively:*

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \textsc{Stab}(A) & = & \big\{\mu(1) < \mu(2) < 1/2\big\} \cap \big\{\mu(1)(1 - \mu(1)) < \mu(2)^2\big\} \\ \textsc{Stab}(B) & = & \big\{\mu(1) < \mu(2) < 1/2\big\}\,. \end{array}$$

Using Lemma 6, we can rephrase Proposition 3 by saying that policy A has the smallest possible stability region, while policy B has the largest possible stability region. The two stability regions are represented in Figure 7.



FIGURE 7. The stability regions : $\textsc{Stab}(A)$ is the dark gray zone and $\textsc{Stab}(B)$ is the union of the dark and light gray zones.

6. Conjecture

In Theorem 2, it is natural to address the converse of (17) : are non-bipartite and separable graphs the only ones that are stable under any matching policies and for any μ satisfying Ncond? We conjecture that this is the case.

Observe that any non-bipartite and non-separable graph contains either the graph of Example 1 or an odd cycle of size larger or equal to 5. So the main remaining step in proving the conjecture is the following one: for any odd cycle G of size at least 5, find a measure $\mu \in \text{Ncond}(G)$ and a matching policy Φ such that the matching model (G, Φ, μ) is unstable.

Here is a first step in this direction.

Proposition 4. *Let G be the cycle of length 5. There exists a measure $\mu \in \text{Ncond}(G)$ and a matching policy Φ such that (G, Φ, μ) is unstable.*

Proof. Let $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ be the cycle of length 5 represented in Figure 8. Consider the following matching policy Φ: items of class 2 (respectively, of class 5) give priority to items of class 3 (resp, of class 4) over items of class 1. The other priority rules are fixed arbitrarily.

Fix $0 < \varepsilon < 2/9$. Consider the following measure μ on $\mathcal{V}$:

$$\begin{cases} \mu(1) &= 1/2 - (3\varepsilon)/4 \\ \mu(2) &= \mu(5) = 1/4 - \varepsilon/8 \\ \mu(3) &= \mu(4) = \varepsilon/2\,. \end{cases}$$

One can check that $\mu \in \text{Ncond}(G)$. The corresponding matching model (G, Φ, μ) is represented in Figure 8. It is stable only if the Markov Chain $(\tilde{U}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is ergodic on the subset $\mathcal{U}_{1,3} = \{1\} \times \{3, 4\}$ of $\mathcal{U}$.



Figure 8. A matching model on the 5-cycle which is unstable even though $\mu \in \text{Ncond}(G)$.

Only one of the classes $3, 4$ can be present at any given time. On the subspace $\mathcal{U}_{1,3}$, the transition matrix of the Markov chain can be explicitly written, and the drifts on the interior and the first axis read

$$\text{Interior}: \; D_x = 1/4 - 5\varepsilon/8, \;\; D_y = -1/4 + \varepsilon/8; \qquad \text{First axis}: \; D'_x = -\varepsilon/2, \;\; D'_y = \varepsilon.$$

We thus have $D_x > 0$, $D_y < 0$ and after computations,

$$\tilde{D}_x D'_y - D_y D'_x = \varepsilon/8 - 9\varepsilon^2/16 \; > \; 0.$$

According to [6, Theorem 3.3.1], the Markov chain is transient on the subspace $\mathcal{U}_{1,3}$, which concludes the proof. □

References

[1] I. Adan, A. Busić, J. Mairesse, and G. Weiss. Reversibility and further properties of FCFS infinite bipartite matching. In preparation.

[2] I. Adan and G. Weiss. Exact FCFS matching rates for two infinite multi-type sequences. *Operations Research*, 60(2):475–489, 2012.

[3] P. Brémaud. *Markov chains: Gibbs fields, Monte Carlo simulation, and queues*, volume 31 of *Texts in Applied Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999.

[4] A. Busić, V. Gupta, and J. Mairesse. Stability of the bipartite matching model. *Adv. Appl. Probab.*, 45(2):351–378, 2013.

[5] R. Caldentey, E.H. Kaplan, and G. Weiss. FCFS infinite bipartite matching of servers and customers. *Adv. Appl. Probab*, 41(3):695–730, 2009.

[6] G. Fayolle, V. Malyshev, and M. Menshikov. *Topics in the constructive theory of countable Markov chains*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.

[7] N. Gans, G. Koole, and A. Mandelbaum. Telephone call centers: tutorial, review and research prospects. *Manufacturing Serv. Oper. Manag.*, 48:79–141, 2003.

[8] N. McKeown, A. Mekkittikul, V. Anantharam, and J. Walrand. Achieving 100% throughput in an input-queued switch. *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, 47(8):1260 –1267, 1999.

[9] L. Tassiulas and A. Ephremides. Stability properties of constrained queueing systems and scheduling policies for maximum throughput in multihop radio networks. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, 37(12):1936–1948, 1992.

CNRS, UMR 7089, LIAFA, Univ Paris Diderot, Sorbonne Paris Cité, F-75205 Paris, France.

E-mail address | : mairesse@liafa.univ-paris-diderot.fr

LMAC, Université de Technologie de Compiègne, 60205 Compiègne Cedex, France.

E-mail address | : pascal.moyal@utc.fr